



*Department of Cardiology
Medical University of Lublin
SPSK Number 4
ul.Jaczewskiego 8
Lublin, Poland
E-mail: m.wojcik@am.lublin.pl

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.04.069>

REFERENCES

- Mohanty S, Mohanty P, Di Biase L, et al. Impact of metabolic syndrome on procedural outcomes in patients with atrial fibrillation undergoing catheter ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;59:1295–301.
- Berkowitsch A, Kuniss M, Greiss H, et al. Impact of impaired renal function and metabolic syndrome on the recurrence of atrial fibrillation after catheter ablation: a long term follow-up. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 2012;35:532–43.
- Tang RB, Dong JZ, Liu XP, et al. Metabolic syndrome and risk of recurrence of atrial fibrillation after catheter ablation. *Circ J* 2009;73:438–43.
- Chang SL, Tuan TC, Tai CT, et al. Comparison of outcome in catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in patients with versus without the metabolic syndrome. *Am J Cardiol* 2009;103:67–72.
- Asirvatham SJ, Jiao Z. What causes atrial fibrillation and why do we fail with ablation? Insights from metabolic syndrome. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;59:1302–3.
- Calkins H, Kuck KH, Cappato R, et al. 2012 HRS/EHRA/ECAS expert consensus statement on catheter and surgical ablation of atrial fibrillation: recommendations for patient selection, procedural techniques, patient management and follow-up, definitions, endpoints, and research trial design. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol* 2012;33:171–257.

- Berkowitsch A, Neumann T, Kuniss M, et al. Therapy with renin-angiotensin system blockers after pulmonary vein isolation in patients with atrial fibrillation: who is a responder? *PACE* 2010;33:1101–11.
- Savelieva I, Kourliouros A, Camm J. Primary and secondary prevention of atrial fibrillation with statins and polyunsaturated fatty acids: review of evidence and clinical relevance. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch Pharmacol* 2010;381:1–13.

Reply

We thank Dr. Wojcik and colleagues for their interest in our study (1).

The apparent contradiction between our findings and their results can be explained by at least 3 factors: difference in study population, detection and elimination of nonpulmonary vein (non-PV) triggers, and use of discretion of the physician in patient selection.

Our population had predominantly nonparoxysmal atrial fibrillation (NPAF), compared with theirs. Most importantly, we observed in the NPAF cohort significantly more frequent non-PV triggers in the metabolic syndrome (MS) group compared with the non-MS group, which is in accordance with earlier studies by others (2). As we discussed in our study, the challenge of eliminating non-PV triggers could have contributed to the higher recurrence in the MS group of the NPAF cohort. Of note,

Berkowitsch et al. (3) did not find any association between MS and non-PV triggers. This is likely because they did not perform any provocative test or pharmacological challenge to disclose non-PV triggers (which we routinely do) and missed a crucial piece of information that limited their approach to pulmonary vein isolation alone. Besides that, their study design allowed physician discretion in selecting radiofrequency versus cryoballoon ablation. The consequent radiofrequency cohort might have been different from ours.

Dr. Wojcik and colleagues raise question on the homogeneity of the study groups in terms of left atrium size (LAS). We agree that the propensity score matching is important in reducing bias. However, this involves the assumption of conditional independence (i.e., selection bias is eliminated by controlling for differences in observables). We are not certain whether that assumption is true about LAS in the context of MS. Indeed, left atrial dilation has been proposed to be a possible mechanism for the occurrence of atrial fibrillation (AF) in patients with MS (3). Furthermore, many elements of MS are known to be related to increased LAS. Therefore, we consider left atrial dilation as one of the mechanisms of how MS affects the outcome and not a confounder.

With regard to the possible confounding effects of use of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone blockers and statins in patients with and without MS, it can be safely said that the claimed benefit of these upstream drugs in preventing post-ablation AF recurrences is not supported by strong clinical evidence. A recent randomized trial clearly showed no effect of atorvastatin in preventing post-ablation AF recurrences (5), and the randomized trials specifically designed to evaluate the effect of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone blockers on AF recurrence reported negative results (5).

Finally, we acknowledge that longer follow-up would provide better insight into this association.

Sanghamitra Mohanty, MD
Prasant Mohanty, MBBS, MPH
Pasquale Santangeli, MD
Luigi Di Biase, MD, PhD
***Andrea Natale, MD**

*3000 N. I-35, Suite 720
Austin, Texas 78705
E-mail: dr.natale@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.05.070>

REFERENCES

1. Mohanty S, Mohanty P, Di Biase L, et al. Impact of metabolic syndrome on procedural outcomes in patients with atrial fibrillation undergoing catheter ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;59:1295–301.
2. Chang S, Tuan T, Tai C. Comparison of outcome in catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in patients with versus without the metabolic syndrome. *Am J Cardiol* 2009;103:67–72.
3. Berkowitsch A, Kuniss M, Greiss H et al. Impact of impaired renal function and metabolic syndrome on the recurrence of atrial fibrillation after catheter ablation: a long term follow-up. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 2012;35:532–43.
4. Nicolaou VN, Papadakis JE, Karatzis EN, Dermitzaki SI, Tsakiris AK, Skoufas PD. Impact of the metabolic syndrome on atrial size in patients with new-onset atrial fibrillation. *Angiology* 2007;58:21–5.
5. Sulciman M, Koestler C, Lerman A, et al. Atorvastatin for prevention of atrial fibrillation recurrence following pulmonary vein isolation: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial. *Heart Rhythm* 2012;9:172–8.
6. Savelieva I, Kakouros N, Kourliouros A, Camm AJ. Upstream therapies for management of atrial fibrillation: review of clinical evidence and implications for European Society of Cardiology guidelines. Part II: secondary prevention. *Europace* 2011;13:610–25.